



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/065,479

10/22/2002

Mohamed Ahmed Ali

121840-1

5667

41838

7590

11/14/2005

GENERAL ELECTRIC COMPANY (PCPI)

C/O FLETCHER YODER

P. O. BOX 692289

HOUSTON, TX 77269-2289

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, THUONG

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2155

DATE MAILED: 11/14/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/065,479	<b>Applicant(s)</b> ALI ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Thuong T. Nguyen	<b>Art Unit</b> 2155	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 October 2002.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-38 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-38 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 22 October 2002 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>10/22/02</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. This action is in response to application 10/065,479 filed 10/22/02. Claims 1-38 are pending and represent method, system, and storage medium for performing synchronous quality function deployment over a computer network.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The inventor fails to explain how to resurrect a completed QFD session.

4. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

5. Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. The inventor fails to explain how to resurrect a completed QFD session.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

6. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

7. Claims 1-6, 9-14, 16, 18-20, 22-23, 26, 28, 30-32, 34-35 and 38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Rosnow Patent No. 2003/01063039 A1.

Rosnow teaches the invention as claimed including computer-implemented system and method for project development (see abstract).

8. As to claim 1, a system comprising:

Create New QFD session component (page 4, paragraph 45; Rosnow discloses that the system of creating new project);

an Active QFD session component (page 5, paragraph 47; Rosnow discloses that the system of display the user's project list plus activity);

a Finished QFD session component (page 5, paragraph 53; Rosnow discloses that the system of completing/terminating/abandon the project); and

a Scheduled QFD session component (page 6, paragraph 55; Rosnow discloses that the system of displaying the schedule of the project);

wherein said lightweight thin client server executes said QFD tool and said at least two client systems access said QFD tool in real time via said real-time server

(page 2, paragraph 12; page 3, paragraph 37; page 6, paragraph 58 and figure 8; Rosnow discloses that the system of using the real-time system including the server and the clients).

9. As to claim 2, Rosnow teaches the system as recited in claim 1, wherein a QFD session identification (page 4, paragraph 41; Rosnow discloses that the system of present the session based on the authorized user who provides the appropriate name and password or the unique user security information);

a start time of the QFD session and an end time of the QFD session (page 4, paragraph 46; Rosnow discloses that the system of presenting the timeline of the project); and

wherein further an identification of the user creating the QFD session is associated with the QFD session (page 4, paragraph 41; Rosnow discloses that the system of recognize the user by the user name and password or unique identification).

10. As to claim 3, Rosnow teaches the system as recited in claim 1, comprising: QFD session identifiers; QFD session creators; date of said QFD sessions; and time of said QFD sessions (figure 7a and 7b ).

11. As to claim 4, Rosnow teaches the system as recited in claim 1, wherein said Finished QFD session component enables a user to resurrect a completed QFD session (page 7, paragraph 75; Rosnow discloses that the system of creating, deleting and editing the completed project).

12. As to claim 5, Rosnow teaches the system as recited in claim 1, wherein said Active QFD session component enables a user to view a listing of QFD sessions in progress (figure 7f).

13. As to claim 6, Rosnow teaches the system as recited in claim 1, wherein said Active QFD session component requires password authorization for participating in an active QFD session, and wherein further, by selecting a QFD session in progress, a user enters said QFD session (page 4, paragraph 44; Rosnow discloses that the system of requesting the password authorization to access the appropriate project).

14. As to claim 9, Rosnow teaches the system as recited in claim 8, wherein said information is exchanged in graphical form (page 7, paragraph 69; Rosnow discloses that the system of displaying the window on the user's graphical user interface for emailing the project or exchange information).

15. As to claim 10, Rosnow teaches the system as recited in claim 8, wherein said information includes: documents; files; and programs (figure 7c ).

16. As to claim 12, Rosnow teaches the system as recited in claim 7, wherein said list of attendees includes attendee information including:

name of attendee and role of attendee (page 4, paragraph 40; Rosnow discloses that the system of names and role of the participants);

job title of attendee (page 6, paragraph 61; Rosnow discloses that the system of display the job title of the participants);

business affiliation of attendee (page 5, paragraph 54; Rosnow discloses that the system of providing the person documents based on the employee, organization, rules and relationship); and

geographical location of attendee (page 5, paragraph 54; Rosnow discloses that the system of providing the person documents based on the employee, organization, rules, location and relationship).

17. As to claim 13, Rosnow teaches the system as recited in claim 12, wherein said role of attendee includes team member (page 5, paragraph 53; Rosnow discloses that the system of presenting the team member of the project).

18. As to claim 14, Rosnow teaches the system as recited in claim 7, wherein: view voting booth activities, override voting booth activities, approve voting booth activities and voting results, edit said information exchanged in said collaborative workspace, and approve access to active QFD sessions (page 6, paragraph 63; page 10, paragraph 108; Rosnow discloses that the system of review, approval, distribution of the every user across the organization; Rosnow also discloses that the system of analyzing the risk assessment based on the amount of risk that is given through the project and the calculation of the factor criteria).

19. As to claim 16, Rosnow teaches the method as recited in claim 15, further comprising a facilitation control panel option operable for allowing a facilitator of said active QFD session to control said active QFD session and direct communications among said session members (page 7, paragraph 71; Rosnow discloses that the

method of providing the facilitation control which the user can create a project, defines the tasks, defines the timeline of the project et.,).

20. As to claim 18, Rosnow teaches the method as recited in claim 17, wherein said attendee list includes attendee names (page 4, paragraph 40; Rosnow discloses that the system of names and role of the participants).

21. As to claim 19, Rosnow teaches the method as recited in claim 15, wherein said collaboration includes exchanging information among said session members, said information including files (figure 7c).

22. As to claim 20, Rosnow teaches the method as recited in claim 19, wherein said information is exchanged in a formatting including graphics (page 7, paragraph 69; Rosnow discloses that the system of displaying the window on the user's graphical user interface for emailing the project or exchange information).

23. As to claim 22, Rosnow teaches the method as recited in claim 15, wherein said providing access to said active QFD session includes verifying whether a person requesting access to said active QFD session a creator of said active QFD session (page 4, paragraph 45; Rosnow discloses that the system of creating new project).

24. The method of claim 23, Rosnow teaches the method as recited in claim 22, wherein editing said QFD session information, editing voting methods provided via said voting booth option, viewing activities conducted by said session members (page 6, paragraph 63; page 10, paragraph 108; Rosnow discloses that the system of review, approval, distribution of the every user across the organization; Rosnow also discloses



that the method of analyzing the risk assessment based on the amount of risk that is given through the project and the calculation of the factor criteria).

25. As to claim 26, Rosnow teaches the method as recited in claim 25, wherein a dashboard sits on top of said house of quality and is affected by changes in CTQs of said subsystems, said dashboard indicating top level CTQs (page 8, paragraph 77; Rosnow discloses that the method of creating the dashboard which provides the overview projects information).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

26. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

27. Claims 7, 21 and 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rosnow, Patent No. 2003/0106039 in view of Brown, Patent No. 2003/0055897 A1.

Rosnow teaches the invention as claimed including computer-implemented system and method for project development (see abstract).

28. As to claim 7, Rosnow teaches the system as recited in claim 6. Rosnow fails to teach the limitation wherein said 'Active QFD session' component displays: a collaborative workspace; a list of attendees; a voting booth; and a facilitation control panel.

However, Brown teaches specifying monitored user participation in messaging sessions (see abstract). Brown teaches the limitation wherein a collaborative workspace; a list of attendees; a voting booth; and a facilitation control panel (figure 4).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Rosnow in view of Brown so that the user could see the list of participants, a ranking and the display, which would provide the full control. One would be motivated to do so to provides the team leader more control and flexibility over the project.

29. As to claim 21, Rosnow teaches the method as recited in claim 17. Rosnow fails to teach the limitation wherein said updating said QFD information includes updating said QFD information to reflect the relative importance of CTQ attributes and CTQ values adopted or approved during said active QFD session.

However, Brown teaches the limitation wherein said updating said QFD information includes updating said QFD information to reflect the relative importance of CTQ attributes and CTQ values adopted or approved during said active QFD session (figure 6).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Rosnow in view of Brown so that the user would understand the project more by providing the appropriate display of the rating for each users or project. One would be motivated to do so to present more and concise presentation.

30. Claims 8, 15, 17, 24-25, 27, 29 and 36-37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rosnow, Patent No. 2003/0106039 in view of Ostrowski, Patent No. 6,301,516 B1.

Rosnow teaches the invention as claimed including computer-implemented system and method for project development (see abstract).

31. As to claim 8, Rosnow teaches the system as recited in claim 7. Rosnow fails to teach the limitation wherein attendees of an active QFD session exchange information in real time, said information including: critical to quality attributes; critical to quality values; key control parameters; key control parameter values; interaction weights; and house of quality data.

However, Ostrowski teaches method for identifying critical to quality dependencies (see abstract). Ostrowski teaches the limitation wherein critical to quality attributes, critical to quality values, key control parameters, key control parameter values, interaction weights, and house of quality data (figure 1).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Rosnow in view of Ostrowski so that the project would be analyze in such a way that every document is breaking down to the customer requirement into manageable and actionable details. One would be motivated to do so to divided the customer requirements into different level to provide better quality service.

32. As to claim 11, Rosnow teaches the system as recited in claim 7. Rosnow fails to teach the limitation wherein said voting booth includes instructions for selecting and prioritizing said information exchanged in said active QFD.

However, Ostrowski teaches the limitation wherein said voting booth includes instructions for selecting and prioritizing said information exchanged in said active QFD (col 2, lines 63-68; Ostrowski discloses that the system of identified the key control parameters of the greatest effect on the project).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Rosnow in view of Ostrowski so that the user could have the most accurate and up to date percentage completed of the project. One would be motivated to do so to provided the user with the prioritized task of the project, to manage the project in the timely manner.

33. As to claim 15, Rosnow teaches a method comprising:

receiving a request to participate in an active QFD session (page 4, paragraph 44; Rosnow teaches the method of );

presenting a list of active QFD sessions (page 5, paragraph 47; Rosnow teaches the method of presenting the list of project activity);

presenting QFD session information relating to said active QFD session (page 5, paragraph 53; Rosnow teaches the method of retrieve the requested document and translate the requested document);

providing a common area operable for facilitating collaboration among session members via computer screens of said at least two client systems (page 6, paragraph 56; Rosnow teaches the method of providing the users the ability to develop, manage, and monitor business processes);

upon completion of said collaboration, presenting a voting booth option (page 6, paragraph 63; Rosnow teaches the method of scalable applications deployed for the organization);

receiving votes from said session members relating to said QFD information via said voting booth option (page 4, paragraph 46; Rosnow teaches the method of providing the status for the project); and

updating QFD session information in said data storage device to reflect results of said collaboration (page 15, paragraph 228; Rosnow teaches the method of updating the project); and

But Rosnow fails to teach the limitation where electronically generating scorecards and tabulating said votes;

However, Brown teaches the limitation wherein tabulating said votes (figure 4) and Ostrowski teaches the limitation wherein electronically generating scorecards (col 2, lines 33-42; Ostrowski discloses that the method of calculating scorecards).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Rosnow in view of Brown and Ostrowski so that the customer could view the project in the tabulating display and automatically getting the scorecard as the result for the project. One would be motivated to do so to present clear and concise result.

34. As to claim 17, Rosnow teaches the method as recited in claim 15. Rosnow fails to teach the limitation wherein said QFD session information includes at least one of: an attendee list of session members online for said active QFD session; critical to quality

(CTQ) attributes; CTQ values; key control parameters (KCPs); KCP values; and a facilitator of said active QFD session.

However, Ostrowski teaches the limitation wherein an attendee list of session members online for said active QFD session; critical to quality (CTQ) attributes; CTQ values; key control parameters (KCPs); KCP values; and a facilitator of said active QFD session (figure 1).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Rosnow in view of Ostrowski so that the project would be analyze in such a way that every document is breaking down to the customer requirement into manageable and actionable details. One would be motivated to do so to divided the customer requirements into different level to provide better quality service.

35. As to claim 24, Rosnow teaches the method as recited in claim 15. Rosnow fails to teach the limitation wherein said scorecards contain key control parameters to be monitored for a given scenario.

However, Ostrowski teaches the limitation wherein said scorecards contain key control parameters to be monitored for a given scenario (col 2, lines 33-42; Ostrowski discloses that the method of generating the total score by using the key control parameter and the interaction weight).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Rosnow in view of Ostrowski so that the team leader/customer would have an up-to-date progress of the project. One would be motivated to do so to present the customer a most accurate result based on the calculated scores.

36. As to claim 25, Rosnow teaches the method as recited in claim 24. Rosnow fails to teach the limitation wherein houses of quality for said scorecards are drilled down to subsystems.

However, Ostrowski teaches the limitation wherein houses of quality for said scorecards are drilled down to subsystems (col 2, lines 50-57; figure 1; Ostrowski discloses that the method of using the total scores to predict the houses of quality for the project).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Rosnow in view of Ostrowski so that the project would get the most accurate result. One would be motivated to do so to provides the system which would satisfied the customer based on the quality function deployment method and the key factors such as critical to quality characteristics and key control parameter and houses of quality.

37. Claims 27-38 do not teach or define any new limitations beyond the above claims and therefore are rejected above.

### **Contact Information**

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thuong T. Nguyen whose telephone number is 571-272-3864. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:30AM-4:30PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Saleh Najjar can be reached on 571-272-4006. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Thuong T Nguyen  
Patent Examiner/Art Unit 2155

  
SALEH NAJJAR  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER